

Sonya D. Winner (Bar No. 200348)  
 swinner@cov.com  
 Nathan E. Shafroth (Bar No. 232505)  
 nshafroth@cov.com  
 COVINGTON & BURLING LLP  
 Salesforce Tower  
 415 Mission Street, Suite 5400  
 San Francisco, California 94105-2533  
 Telephone: + 1 (415) 591-6000  
 Facsimile: + 1 (415) 591-6091

Attorneys for Defendant  
 MCKESSON CORPORATION  
*(Additional parties and counsel listed on signature page)*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO,  
 et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

PURDUE PHARMA L.P., et al.

Defendants.

Civil Case No.: 3:18-CV-07591-CRB

**DEFENDANTS' STATUS REPORT**

Hearing Date: February 26, 2020  
 Hearing Time: 12:00 p.m.  
 Hearing Place: Courtroom 6

Honorable Charles R. Breyer

This case is in most respects at the very earliest stage. No defendant has answered or otherwise responded to the Complaint, and defendants have not yet had the opportunity to seek or obtain any discovery. While plaintiffs have the advantage of extensive discovery taken from some of the defendants that also are named in other cases, this complex case is in all other material respects at the very beginning.

As the Court has requested, this status report describes the extensive discovery defendants expect to require and estimates, based on defendants' experience in other cases and their knowledge of the pleadings here, the minimum time necessary to complete that discovery. But defendants first offer some brief background about this case and its status.

**I. The Status of the National MDL**

This case was filed on December 18, 2018 and on January 22, 2019 transferred to MDL 2804 before Judge Dan Polster in the Northern District of Ohio. It has been stayed ever since, along with more than 2,600 other cases pending in MDL 2804. In April 2018, Judge Polster designated three cases brought by Ohio counties and municipalities as “Track One” cases. Discovery proceeded only in those cases. Plaintiffs obtained “national” discovery of many of the defendants here (e.g., activities relating to their general corporate policies and practices) and case-specific discovery focused on their activities in Northern Ohio. Defendants were permitted to take discovery relating to the claims of the Track One plaintiffs only, including discovery addressing issues such as causation, injury, damages, and the statute of limitations as it pertained to the claims of those Northern Ohio plaintiffs. No discovery was taken in the MDL concerning San Francisco (or any other part of California), and no legal issues under California law were addressed.

All other cases in MDL 2804 – including this case – remained stayed, with a complete moratorium on case filings with few exceptions, two of which are relevant to understanding the posture of this action. First, plaintiffs in the stayed cases were authorized to file “short form” amended complaints to add defendants and incorporate allegations from other pleadings. Plaintiffs here filed such a short-form amendment on April 22, 2019, which defendants attach as Exhibit A. That short-form amendment, which is not yet on the formal docket in this Court, is important to understanding the full extent of the parties and claims at issue. Second, the plaintiffs in the stayed cases were required to provide abbreviated fact sheets with basic information about their claims. Plaintiffs’ fact sheet is attached as Exhibit B.

No motions or other responses to either plaintiffs’ original complaint or their short-form amended complaint were permitted in the MDL. Thus, in this case, even threshold issues remain unresolved, such as whether plaintiffs have stated a claim for relief and whether the Court has personal

1 jurisdiction over all defendants.<sup>1</sup> And defendants in this action have taken no party or third-party  
2 discovery addressing plaintiffs' claims.

3 The sole area in which this case is not at the very earliest stage is in discovery taken *by* plaintiffs  
4 *from* most (but not all) defendants. In response to discovery propounded by the Plaintiffs' Executive  
5 Committee ("PEC") in the MDL, which was charged with pursuing this role on behalf of all MDL  
6 plaintiffs as well as the individual Track One plaintiffs, defendants in the Track One cases (which  
7 included most of the defendants named in this case) produced massive amounts of discovery, including  
8 many millions of pages of documents and responses to hundreds of interrogatories. Hundreds of  
9 depositions were taken of defendants' witnesses. While some of this discovery was specific to Northern  
10 Ohio, most of it was national in scope and not limited to information relevant to the Track One  
11 plaintiffs' cases. Plaintiffs have access to all of this discovery from defendants, and it is likely to form  
12 the substantial majority of the evidence they will use in this case.

13 However, there are at least two defendants to this lawsuit that have not been subject to any  
14 discovery in the MDL or any meaningful discovery in other opioid matters pending in federal or state  
15 courts nationwide. West-Ward Pharmaceuticals (n/k/a/ Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA Inc.) is a generic  
16 manufacturer that was neither involved in, nor named in, any of the MDL Track One and MDL  
17 Track Two cases in which discovery was taken. While Hikma has been named as a defendant in a few  
18 state court opioid matters, those unrelated opioid lawsuits have not advanced to the stage where Hikma  
19 has been required to produce any documents or has even negotiated a scope of production. No Hikma  
20 employees have been deposed. Hikma also has not taken any discovery of any governmental plaintiff.

21 Defendant Noramco, Inc. is in a similar position. Noramco, Inc., is an active pharmaceutical  
22 ingredient manufacturer which does not (and did not at all material times relevant to this litigation)  
23 manufacture, package, promote, brand, market, distribute, or sell the finished drug products at issue in  
24 this litigation. While it was a defendant in the MDL Track One cases, plaintiffs did not pursue  
25

---

26 <sup>1</sup> Contrary to the assertion by plaintiffs in their short-form amendment, not all defendants have been  
27 served. For example, several domestic and non-U.S. defendants have not been served, and (even if they  
28 had been) questions of personal jurisdiction as to any foreign defendant will need to be resolved through  
motion practice.

1 discovery against it, prompting Judge Polster to sever it from the Track One trial. It was also severed  
2 from Track Two. In the few state cases in which Noramco is a party, discovery is either ongoing or has  
3 not started. No party depositions have been taken of Noramco employees.

4 Thus, while this case may be far along with respect to plaintiffs' discovery, it is effectively a  
5 brand new case for defendants, and it must be litigated on the type of full schedule required for a  
6 complex case with multiple claims and multiple, differently-situated, defendants.

## 7 **II. Dispositive Motions**

8 No defendant has answered or otherwise responded to the Complaint, and some have not been  
9 served. Defendants intend to move to dismiss the Complaint on multiple grounds, including failure to  
10 state a claim. These motions will address important threshold legal issues. Some defendants will also  
11 move to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction.

12 Defendants propose that all Rule 12 motions by those entities that have been served be due by  
13 April 13, 2020.

14 Defendants believe that the most efficient course is to resolve those threshold motions before  
15 discovery commences, as the Court's ruling on those motions is likely to streamline the case at a  
16 minimum and assist the parties in focusing their discovery efforts in an efficient manner.

## 17 **III. Status of Discovery**

### 18 **A. Discovery of Defendants**

19 Plaintiffs' counsel here serve on the Plaintiffs' Executive Committee in the MDL and, as such,  
20 have actively participated in more than a year of discovery from most of the defendants, receiving  
21 millions of pages of documents and taking scores of depositions. Defendants assume that plaintiffs  
22 intend to seek additional discovery from defendants of information particular to San Francisco that was  
23 not specifically at issue in the MDL. Plaintiffs have not yet propounded any non-MDL discovery on  
24 defendants, nor have the parties discussed the additional discovery plaintiffs intend to seek from  
25 defendants.

### 26 **B. Discovery of Plaintiffs**

27 Discovery of the City and County of San Francisco has not yet begun. As plaintiffs' fact sheet  
28 (Exhibit B) makes clear, the amount of discovery that will be needed here is substantial. So far,

1 plaintiffs' only "production" of documents has consisted of 18 documents comprising 156 pages  
2 attached to their fact sheet. They have not answered a single interrogatory, produced a single witness  
3 for deposition, or produced any documents in response to discovery requests.

4 This is not the kind of case in which discovery requirements can or should be largely one-sided.  
5 As discussed further below, in these cases defendants require at least as much discovery as do plaintiffs  
6 – and given the immense head start plaintiffs have here, the vast majority of the discovery that remains  
7 to be done will be that taken by defendants. Before Judge Polster, discovery of plaintiffs Cuyahoga  
8 County and Summit County – which included production of millions of pages of documents and scores  
9 of depositions – took 18 months to complete.

10 Discovery of the plaintiffs is critical to probe plaintiffs' allegations about the impact of opioid  
11 abuse on San Francisco and the State of California, including whether and to what extent defendants'  
12 alleged conduct affected plaintiffs' governmental operations; when plaintiffs knew or should have  
13 known of their claims; and whether plaintiffs can prove the necessary element of causation. Plaintiffs'  
14 claims depend on proof of proximate causation between their alleged injuries and the conduct alleged.  
15 Defendants will seek discovery to confirm that plaintiffs cannot prove the required links between  
16 defendants' manufacture or shipment of prescription opioids and plaintiffs' alleged injuries, most of  
17 which allegedly resulted from the importation and abuse of illegal heroin and fentanyl. Additionally,  
18 discovery will be sought to identify the myriad acts of wrongdoing by many independent actors – such  
19 as those engaged in the criminal diversion of opioids and their illicit use – which destroy any purported  
20 chain of causation.

21 Plaintiffs allege that they have incurred damages including "the costs of treating opioid  
22 addiction," "the costs of maintaining harm reduction, overdose prevention and education on the dangers  
23 of opioid use," "special costs incurred by San Francisco for the public safety, health and welfare of its  
24 citizens," and "the economic harm to San Francisco resulting from the addiction epidemic." Complaint  
25 ¶ 265. Defendants will need discovery on all of plaintiffs' alleged costs or other damages, as well as  
26 associated evidence relating to those alleged damages that are in plaintiffs' exclusive possession.

27 Defendants have learned from experience in these cases (both in Track One and in cases pending  
28 in state court) that discovery from a municipal defendant on claims like these can be complicated and

difficult.<sup>2</sup> Necessary information and documents are typically spread across multiple different municipal agencies and employees. State and federal programs intersect with – and in some instances pay for – municipal programs. The challenge is enhanced by the fact that plaintiffs purport to assert claims addressing conduct and events going back more than a decade.<sup>3</sup>

In short, in contrast to the tremendous amount of discovery taken of defendants, discovery has not yet even begun on a wide array of facts that are necessary for defendants to present their defenses.<sup>4</sup>

### C. Third-Party Discovery

Defendants will also need to pursue extensive, jurisdiction-specific third-party discovery, including from state and federal entities and third-party payors. This discovery will establish potential alternative causes of plaintiffs' alleged injury, which is crucial to defendants' causation case. Plaintiffs sue only certain pharmaceutical manufacturers and wholesale distributors, but no prescription opioid pill could reach a patient without a physician's decision to prescribe it and a pharmacist's decision to dispense it. Even if these third parties are not at fault, their independent conduct goes directly to a core issue in this case: lack of causation. Moreover, much of plaintiffs' alleged harm resulted from use of illegal opioids, which could have no impact on plaintiffs absent the intervening conduct of multiple criminal actors. In other cases asserting similar claims, there has been extensive discovery of federal and state law enforcement concerning these and related issues.

Defendants expect discovery from state agencies to be particularly extensive, including, but not limited to, discovery from the California Board of Pharmacy, which administers and enforces the California Uniform Controlled Substances Act and its implementing regulations; the California

---

<sup>2</sup> Indeed, one of the original Track One plaintiffs, the City of Cleveland, had to be dropped from Track One after it became clear that it could not meet its discovery obligations.

<sup>3</sup> Defendants naturally expect to assert the statute of limitations as to any claims that accrued prior to the applicable limitations period. But until that issue is resolved in their favor, they must pursue discovery covering the entire period plaintiffs' claims purport to cover.

<sup>4</sup> A few of the defendants here are also defendants in an action pending in state court in Orange County brought by that county and a few other governmental entities. That Orange County action involves only a small subset of the defendants in this action (four of the manufacturer defendants) and a different (and smaller) set of claims. While those defendants have taken discovery in that case, such discovery has been mainly directed to the plaintiff jurisdictions at issue in that litigation and the claims in that case, and was not directed at San Francisco or the variety of claims asserted by it here.

Department of Justice, which administers the State's Controlled Substance Utilization Review and Evaluation System (California's prescription drug monitoring program); state professional boards that license and regulate physicians, dentists, nurses, and other medical professionals who may have improperly prescribed or administered controlled substances; and state agencies that administer medical insurance programs, including Medicaid.

#### IV. Limitations on Discovery and Timing of Discovery

In light of the number of defendants and the complexity of this case, modifications to the presumptive limitations on discovery under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure will be necessary. The parties have not yet discussed appropriate limitations. Defendants propose that the Court address appropriate limitations on discovery only after resolution of defendants' planned motions to dismiss, together with an appropriate case schedule.

Defendants estimate that fact discovery will take approximately **18 months**. This is the same amount of time required for discovery in Track One and in cases that are being litigated in state court.

#### V. Expert Discovery

After fact discovery closes, the parties will need to engage in extensive expert discovery. Plaintiffs' case likely will rest largely on their expert reports and testimony, including to show alleged misconduct, causation, and damages. The MDL Track One plaintiffs named 23 experts, and plaintiffs here likely will name a similar number. Defendants will need to disclose, produce reports, and offer depositions of an even larger number of experts in response, given the multitude of defendants that plaintiffs have chosen to sue under a variety of different theories. Defendants estimate that expert discovery will require an additional **three months** following the close of fact discovery.

#### VI. Pretrial Motions

Following expert discovery, there are likely to be multiple motions for summary judgment and *Daubert* motions. Once summary judgment and *Daubert* motions are resolved and the general scope of trial (if any) is clear, the parties will require time for motions *in limine* and pretrial hearings.

\* \* \*

1 For the foregoing reasons, defendants therefore respectfully request that the Court set deadlines  
2 only for briefing and a hearing on defendants' motions to dismiss, with further deadlines to be set  
3 following resolution of those motions.

4  
5 DATED: February 19, 2020

Respectfully Submitted,

6 By: /s/ Sonya D. Winner  
7 Sonya D. Winner  
8 Nathan E. Shafroth  
9 Covington & Burling LLP  
10 COVINGTON & BURLING LLP  
11 Salesforce Tower  
12 415 Mission Street, Suite 5400  
13 San Francisco, California 94105-2533  
14 Telephone: + 1 (415) 591-6000  
15 Facsimile: + 1 (415) 591-6091

16 *Attorneys for Defendant*  
17 *McKesson Corporation*

18 DATED: February 19, 2020

19 By: /s/ Steven J. Boranian  
20 Steven J. Boranian  
21 REED SMITH LLP  
22 101 Second Street, Suite 1800  
23 San Francisco, CA 94105  
24 Telephone: (415) 543-8700  
25 Facsimile: (415) 391-8269  
26 sboranian@reedsmith.com

27 Sarah B. Johansen  
28 REED SMITH LLP  
355 South Grand Avenue, Suite 2900  
Los Angeles, CA 90071  
Telephone: (213) 457-8000  
Facsimile: (213) 457-8080  
sjohansen@reedsmith.com

*Attorneys for Defendants*  
*AmerisourceBergen Corporation and*  
*AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation*



1 DATED: February 19, 2020

2 By: /s/ Neelum J. Wadhwani  
3 Neelum J. Wadhwani (Bar No. 247948)  
4 Enu A. Mainigi (*pro hac vice application*  
5 *forthcoming*)  
6 WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY LLP  
7 725 Twelfth Street, NW  
8 Washington, DC 20005  
9 Tel: (202) 434-5000  
10 Fax: (202) 434-5029  
11 nwadhwani@wc.com  
12 emainigi@wc.com

13 *Attorneys for Defendant*  
14 *Cardinal Health, Inc.*  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 DATED: February 19, 2020

2 By: /s/ Zachary Hill  
3 Zachary Hill, Bar No. 275886  
4 MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP  
5 zachary.hill@morganlewis.com  
6 One Market, Spear Street Tower  
7 San Francisco, CA 94105-1596  
8 Tel: +1.415.442.1000  
9 Fax: +1.415.442.1001

7 Eric W. Sitarchuk\*  
8 Rebecca J. Hillyer\*  
9 MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP  
10 eric.sitarchuk@morganlewis.com  
11 rebecca.hillyer@morganlewis.com  
12 1701 Market Street  
13 Philadelphia, 19103-2921  
14 Tel: +1.215.963.5000  
15 Fax: +1.215.963.5001

13 Wendy West Feinstein\*  
14 MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP  
15 wendy.feinstein@morganlewis.com  
16 One Oxford Centre, Thirty-Second Floor  
17 Pittsburgh, PA 15219-6401  
18 Tel: +1.412.560.7455  
19 Fax: +1.412.560.7001

17 *Attorneys for Defendants*  
18 *Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., Cephalon,*  
19 *Inc., Actavis LLC, Watson Laboratories, Inc.,*  
20 *and Actavis Pharma, Inc. f/k/a Watson Pharma,*  
21 *Inc.*

21 *\*Denotes national counsel, pro hac vice*  
22 *forthcoming*

1 DATED: February 19, 2020

2 By: /s/ Sean O. Morris

3 Sean O. Morris

4 John D. Lombardo

5 ARNOLD & PORTER KAYE SCHOLER LLP

6 777 South Figueroa Street, 44th Floor

7 Los Angeles, California 90017-5844

8 Telephone: +1-213-243-4000

9 Facsimile: +1-213-243-4199

10 Email: Sean.Morris@arnoldporter.com

11 Email: John.Lombardo@arnoldporter.com

12 *Attorneys for Defendants*

13 *Endo Pharmaceuticals Inc., Endo Health*

14 *Solutions Inc., Par Pharmaceutical, Inc.,*

15 *and Par Pharmaceutical Companies, Inc.*

1 DATED: February 19, 2020

2 By: /s/ Amy J. Laurendeau  
3 Amy J. Laurendeau (S.B. #198321)  
4 O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP  
5 610 Newport Center Drive, 17th Floor  
6 Newport Beach, CA 92660  
7 (949) 823-6900  
8 alaurendeau@omm.com

9 Charles C. Lifland (S.B. #108950)  
10 Sabrina H. Strong (S.B. #200292)  
11 O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP  
12 400 S. Hope Street  
13 Los Angeles, CA 90071  
14 (213) 430-6000  
15 clifland@omm.com  
16 sstrong@omm.com

17 Amy R. Lucas (S.B. #264034)  
18 O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP  
19 1999 Avenue of the Stars, 8th Floor  
20 Los Angeles, CA 90067  
21 (310) 553-6700  
22 alucas@omm.com

23 Stephen D. Brody (*pro hac vice forthcoming*)  
24 O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP  
25 1625 Eye Street, NW  
26 Washington, DC 20006  
27 (202) 383-5300  
28 sbrody@omm.com

*Attorneys for Defendant*  
*Janssen Pharmaceuticals, Inc.*

1 DATED: February 19, 2020

2 By: /s/ Rocky C. Tsai  
3 Rocky C. Tsai (SBN #221452)  
4 *rocky.tsai@ropesgray.com*  
5 Traci J. Irvin (SBN #309432)  
6 *traci.irvin@ropesgray.com*  
7 ROPES & GRAY LLP  
8 Three Embarcadero Center  
9 San Francisco, CA 94111-4006  
10 Tel: (415) 315-6300  
11 Fax: (415) 315-6350

12 *Attorneys for Defendant*  
13 *Mallinckrodt LLC*

14 DATED: February 19, 2020

15 By: /s/ Michael Onufer  
16 Michael Onufer (Bar No. 300903)  
17 KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP  
18 555 South Flower Street  
19 Los Angeles, CA 90071  
20 Telephone: (213) 680-8400  
21 Email: *michael.onufer@kirkland.com*

22 Jennifer G. Levy, P.C. (*pro hac vice*  
23 *forthcoming*)  
24 KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP  
25 1301 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.  
26 Washington, D.C. 20004  
27 Telephone: (202) 879-5000  
28 Facsimile: (202) 879-5200  
Email: *jennifer.levy@kirkland.com*

Donna Welch, P.C. (*pro hac vice forthcoming*)  
Timothy W. Knapp, P.C. (*pro hac vice forthcoming*)  
KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP  
300 North LaSalle, Chicago, IL 60654  
Telephone: (312) 862-2000  
Facsimile: (312) 862-2200  
*donna.welch@kirkland.com*  
*tknapp@kirkland.com*

*Attorneys for Defendants*  
*Allergan Finance, LLC f/k/a Actavis, Inc. f/k/a/*  
*Watson Pharmaceuticals, Inc., Allergan Sales,*  
*LLC and Allergan USA, Inc.*

1 DATED: February 19, 2020

2 By: /s/ Elizabeth A. Sperling  
3 Elizabeth A. Sperling (CA Bar No. 231474)  
4 ALSTON & BIRD LLP  
5 333 South Hope Street, 16th Floor  
6 Los Angeles, CA 90071  
7 Telephone: (213) 576-1000  
8 Fax: (213) 576-1100  
9 elizabeth.sperling@alston.com

10 Daniel G. Jarcho\*  
11 ALSTON & BIRD LLP  
12 950 F Street, NW  
13 Washington, DC 20004  
14 Telephone: (202) 239-3300  
15 Daniel.jarcho@alston.com

16 Cari K. Dawson\*  
17 Jenny A. Hergenrother\*  
18 ALSTON & BIRD LLP  
19 1201 West Peachtree Street, Suite 4900 Atlanta,  
20 GA 30309-3424  
21 Telephone: (404) 881-7000  
22 cari.dawson@alston.com  
23 jenny.hergenrother@alston.com

24 *Attorneys for Defendant Noramco, Inc.*

25 *\*Denotes National counsel who will seek pro*  
26 *hac vice admission*

1 DATED: February 19, 2020

2 By: /s/ Alan R. Ouellette  
3 Alan R. Ouellette (SBN 272745)  
4 FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
5 555 California Street, Suite 1700  
6 San Francisco, CA 94104-1520  
7 Tel: 415.434.4484  
8 Fax: 415.434.4507  
9 Email: aouellette@foley.com

10 James W. Matthews (*Pro Hac Vice* motion  
11 forthcoming)  
12 Ana M. Francisco (*Pro Hac Vice* motion  
13 forthcoming)  
14 Katy E. Koski (*Pro Hac Vice* motion  
15 forthcoming)  
16 FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
17 111 Huntington Avenue  
18 Boston, MA 02199  
19 Tel: 617.342.4000  
20 Fax: 617.342.4001  
21 Email: jmatthews@foley.com  
22 Email: afrancisco@foley.com  
23 Email: kkoski@foley.com

24 *Attorneys for Defendant Anda, Inc.*

1 DATED: February 19, 2020

2 By: /s/ Jennifer M. Cecil  
3 Jennifer M. Cecil  
4 WINSTON & STRAWN LLP  
5 101 California Street  
6 35th Floor  
7 San Francisco, CA 94111-5840  
8 Telephone: (415) 591-1000  
9 Facsimile: (415) 591-1400  
10 jcecil@winston.com

11 Christopher B. Essig (pro hac application  
12 forthcoming)  
13 Scott M. Ahmad (pro hac application  
14 forthcoming)  
15 Reid F. Smith (pro hac application  
16 forthcoming)  
17 Sarah J. Bily (pro hac application forthcoming)  
18 WINSTON & STRAWN LLP  
19 35 W. Wacker Dr.  
20 Chicago, IL 60601-9703  
21 Telephone: (312) 558-5600  
22 Facsimile: (312) 558-5700  
23 cessig@winston.com  
24 sahmah@winston.com  
25 rfsmith@winston.com  
26 sbily@winston.com

27 *Attorneys for Defendant*  
28 *Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA Inc.*  
*(f/k/a West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp.)*



**ATTESTATION**

I, Sonya Winner, hereby attest, pursuant to N.D. Cal. Civil L.R. 5-1, that the concurrence to the filing of this document has been obtained from each signatory hereto.

DATED: February 19, 2020

By: /s/ Sonya D. Winner  
Sonya D. Winner